



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,383	07/07/2003	Frederick J. Sandor SR.	148-109	7395
21091	7590	06/27/2005	EXAMINER	
JOHN H CROZIER 1934 HUNTINGTON TURNPIKE TRUMBULL, CT 06611			TRUONG, BAO Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/614,383		SANDOR, FREDERICK J.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Bao Q. Truong		2875	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 18 and 19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8,13,14 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,7,9-12 and 15-17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1-20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1-3, 8, 13-15 and 18-20, the term "other structural lenses" is indefinite.

Claims 2-12 and 19, "An" in line 1 should be changed to –The--.

Claims 14-17, "A" in line 1 should be changed to –The--.

Claim 17, "Styrofoam" should be changed to its general term.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 13, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Williams [US 4,223,377].

Regarding claim 1, 13 and 20, Williams discloses a light panel having a plurality of lenses [54] resting on ledges of a longitudinal support pan [10], a sealing material [60] disposed therebetween, and a plurality of illumination sources [36] (figures 1-3, column 1 lines 20-25).

Regarding claims 2 and 14, Williams discloses an interior [22] (figure 2).

Regarding claim 4 and 5, Williams discloses the light panel being continuous/non-continuous and non-linear (figures 1, 3 and 4).

Regarding claim 6, Williams discloses arcuate elements [54] (figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of L.B. McEwing et al. [US 1,572,214].

Regarding claim 8, Williams discloses a plurality of lenses [54] (figures 1-2), but does not disclose the bottom surface of the plurality of lenses being formed prismatic glass.

L.B. McEwing et al. discloses a prismatic glass [32] on the bottom of a lens [24] (figure 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lens of Williams with the prismatic glass as taught by L.B. McEwing for purpose of providing a wider light distribution.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 3, 7, 9, 10-12, 15-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 3 and 15, the panel further comprises a support frame being disposed between the plurality of lenses and the support pan.

Claim 7, the support pan has a reflective surface at a bottom.

Claim 9, the panel further comprises a second plurality of lenses being disposed on top of the plurality of lenses.

Claim 10 is dependent on claim 9.

Claim 11, the support pan has sloped sides.

Claim 12 is dependent on claim 11.

Claim 16, the method further comprises a step of installing temporary infill blocks in the support pan, as claimed.

Claim 17 is dependent on claim 16.

7. Claims 18 and 19 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 18, the panel comprises a reflective material disposed in the support pan and a light source disposed above the plurality of lenses.

Claim 19 is dependent on claim 18.

The limitations discussed above are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. E.N. Higley [US 312,269], Konikoff et al. [US 4,340,929], Hanson [US 4,888,669], Blaha [US 5,683,170], Stanford [US 6,082,886], and Remp [US 6,116,751] disclose an illuminated system on the floor or pavement.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bao Q. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-2383. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 AM - 4:00 PM).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra L. O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2875

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bao Q. Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 2875



JOHN ANTHONY WARD
PRIMARY EXAMINER